**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Applicant is submitting herewith, a new set of drawings (10 sheets). Please replace the full set of existing drawings with the version included herewith.

## REMARKS

Claims 18 - 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32 - 34, 36, 37, 40 - 43, and 47 - 49 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 - 17, 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 38, 39, and 44 - 46 are canceled. Claims 50 - 55 are newly added.

Applicant notes with appreciation that in section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 26 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant is rewriting claims 26 and 33 as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant is amending the specification, by way of a substitute specification, to provide consistency (a) between terminology and reference numbers, and (b) with the drawings. The substitute specification does not include any new matter.

Applicant is amending the drawings to provide consistency (a) between terminology and reference numbers, and (b) with the specification. More specifically, Applicant is amending the drawings as explained below.

FIG. 1: (a) Add a line from twist lock 120 to ATS 118; and
(b) Add reference number 138.

FIG. 2: Change reference numeral from "238" to "239".

FIG. 3: (a) Add suffixes to distinguish elements in section 3A from elements in section 3B.
(b) Change reference number from "333" to "333A" (in section 3A) and to "333B" (in section 3B).

FIG. 4: (a) Add reference number "430".
(b) Change reference number from "410" to "444".
(c) Delete reference number "433".

FIG. 5: (a) Add suffixes to distinguish elements in section 5A from elements in section 5B.
(b) Correct reference number for rectifier 426A (in section 5A) and 426B (in section 5B).
(c) Change reference numbers from "442a" and "442b", to "430a" and "430b", respectively.
(d) Change reference number from "431" to "505".

FIG. 6: Delete extraneous features.

FIG. 7: No change is presently being made.

Section 2 of the Office Action, indicates that the Examiner has not approved of FIG. 7 because a block diagram in FIG. 7 contradicts a schematic of FIG. 3. However, Applicant explains below that elements of FIG. 7 correspond to elements of FIGS. 5 and 6.

FIG. 5 is represented in two parts, namely section 5A and section 5B. Elements of FIG. 7 correspond with elements of FIGS. 5 as set forth in the following table:

| FIG. 5 (section 5A) | FIG. 5 (section 5B) | FIG. 7 |
|---|---|---|
| rectifier 426A | | high DC voltage source 705 |
| DC flywheel 428A | | high DC voltage source 710 |
| | rectifier 426B | high DC voltage source 715 |
| | DC flywheel 428B | high DC voltage source 720 |
| PCU 430a | | converter 725 |
| PCU 430b | | converter 735 |

Although bridges 450 are not shown in FIG. 5, the specification, in a description of FIG. 5, in paragraph 0045, explains that each I/O board 440a, 440b routes the respective two 525 VDC power feeds (403a and 403b, or 403c and 403d) through a diode bridge 450 (see FIG. 6), and in paragraph 0046 explains that PCRs 444A-F connect the respective outputs of the PCUs 430a and 430b via another diode bridge. Thus, FIG. 5, in association with the description, discloses a configuration of components as presented in FIG. 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve of FIG. 7.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because the same reference characters are used in FIGS 3A and 3B to designate physically different equipment. Applicant amended FIGS. 3A and 3B to provide different reference characters for different equipment. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection set forth in section 3 of the Office Action.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). In particular, the Office Action indicates that the "fuel cell" and the "UPS" of claims 26 and 33 must be show. However, paragraph 0044 states, "In other embodiments, the alternate power sources 407 are fuel cells, batteries, UPS, other generators, ..." (emphasis added). Thus, fuel cells and UPS are constructively illustrated via the representation of alternate power sources 407. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection set forth in section 4 of the Office Action.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the disclosure is objected to because of the use of the phrase "somewhat schematic.". Applicant is amending the specification to avoid the phrase "somewhat schematic." Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection set forth in section 5 of the Office Action.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 18, 19, 31 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 31 is canceled. Applicant is amending claims 18, 19 and 47 to recite that a conversion of a high DC voltage in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC, to a low DC voltage in a range of about 23 to 48 VDC. The specification, discloses (a) the 300 VDC value in paragraph 0014, (b) the 600 VDC value in FIG. 1, and (c) the 23 to 48 VDC range in paragraph 0010. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection set forth in section 7 of the Office Action.

In section 9 of the Office Action, claims 18 – 25, 27 – 32, 34 – 43 and 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,844,329 to Bailey et al. (hereinafter "the Bailey et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,738 to Pinkerton et al. (hereinafter "the Pinkerton et al. patent") and U.S. Patent No. 5,612,581 to Kageyama (hereinafter "the Kageyama patent"). In this set of rejected claims, three are independent, namely claims 18, 30 and 47. Applicant is amending claims 18, 30 and 47 to recite a combination of features that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited combination of the Bailey et al., Pinkerton et al. and Kageyama patents.

Claim 18 provides for a system. The system includes, *inter alia*, a power feed that distributes a high DC voltage in a building. The high DC voltage is in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC.

The Bailey et al. patent is directed to a system for providing electrical power to equipment on a craft, such as an aircraft, landcraft, watercraft or space craft (Abstract). The Bailey et al. patent does not mention power distribution in a building. Moreover, in a conventional building AC voltage is distributed via an AC power line, and if a piece of equipment requires a low DC voltage, the equipment produces the low DC voltage from the AC power line. Therefore, power distribution in a craft is not suggestive of power distribution in a building. Consequently, the Bailey et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests **a power feed that distributes a high DC voltage in a building**, wherein said high DC voltage is in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC, as recited in claim 18.

The Kageyama patent is directed to a power supply apparatus (Abstract). The Kageyama patent does not mention power distribution in a building. Moreover, as mentioned above, in a conventional building AC voltage is distributed via an AC power line, and if a piece of equipment requires a low DC voltage, the equipment produces the low DC voltage from the AC power line. Consequently, the Kageyama patent neither discloses nor suggests **a power feed that distributes a high DC voltage in a building**, wherein said high DC voltage is in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC, as recited in claim 18.

The Pinkerton et al. patent is directed to a power system (Abstract). The Power system includes a flywheel energy storage device 102, a turbine 104, and an electrical machine 106 mounted on a common shaft 108 (col. 3, lines 50 – 53). During a power outage, electrical machine 106 is operated as a generator (col. 4, lines 8 – 11). For example, during an initial outage mode, shaft 108 is driven by kinetic energy stored in flywheel 102, and electrical machine 106 is operated as a generator (col. 4, lines 49 – 51). The Pinkerton et al. patent does not mention distribution of a DC voltage. Consequently, the Pinkerton et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests **a power feed that distributes a high DC voltage in a building**, wherein said high DC voltage is in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC, as recited in claim 18.

Hence, the Bailey et al., Pinkerton et al., and Kageyama patents, whether considered independently or in combination with one another, neither disclose nor suggest **a power feed that distributes a high DC voltage in a building**, wherein said high DC voltage is in a range of about 300 to 600 VDC, as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over the cited combination of the Bailey et al., Pinkerton et al., and Kageyama patents.

Claims 30 and 47 each include recitals similar to that of claim 18, as described above. Thus, claims 30 and 47, for reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 18, are also patentable over the cited combination of the Bailey et al., Pinkerton et al., and Kageyama patents.

Claims 19 – 23, 25 and 29 depend from claim 18. Claims 32, 34, 36, 37 and 40 – 43 depend from claim 30. Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 47. At least because of these dependencies, claims 19 – 23, 25, 29, 32, 34, 36, 37, 40 – 43, 48 and 49 are also patentable over the cited combination of the Bailey et al., Pinkerton et al., and Kageyama patents.

Claims 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 38 and 39 are canceled. As such, the rejection of claims 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 38 and 39 is rendered moot.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 18 – 25, 27 – 32, 34 – 43 and 47 – 49, as set forth in section 9 of the Office Action.

As mentioned above, Applicant is rewriting claims 26 and 33 in independent form, and amending claims 18, 30 and 47 to recite a feature that is neither described nor suggested by the art of record. Applicant is also amending claims 19, 25, 32, 48 and 49 for one or more of (a) consistency with the independent claims, and (b) ensuring an antecedent basis for terms. None of the amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any term of any claim. Therefore, the doctrine of equivalents should be available for all of the terms of all of the claims.

Applicant is adding claims 50 - 55 to even further provide the claim coverage that Applicant appears to deserve based on the prior art that was cited by the Examiner. A favorable consideration that also results in the allowance of claims 50 - 55 is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

May 22, 2006
Date

Charles N.J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for the Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401